



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/658,975	09/10/2003	Peter R. Anderson	1842.041US1	3982
70648 7590 10/25/2007 SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG & WOESSNER/WMS GAMING P.O. BOX 2938 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402			EXAMINER D'AGOSTINO, PAUL ANTHONY	
			ART UNIT 3714	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 10/25/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Interview Summary

Application No.

10/658,975

Applicant(s)

ANDERSON ET AL.

Examiner

Paul A. D'Agostino

Art Unit

3714

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Paul A. D'Agostino.

(3) Alexander G. Vodovozov.

(2) John Hotaling.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 22 October 2007.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.  
If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: U.S. 5,701,511 to Smith.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

**JOHN M. HOTALING, II**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Examiner requested applicant's representative to cite the support for "a plurality of identification markers and a plurality of audio sequences interlaced between the plurality of identification markers". Given a citation is provided, Examiner believes this language as-is can be rejected under 112 second paragraph for indefiniteness for having two reasonable interpretations (e.g., marker 1 - audio 1 - audio 2, marker 2 etc and marker 1 - audio1, marker 2 audio 2 etc.), the former in need of a citation showing support in the specification and the former and latter anticipated by Smith. Lastly, applicant's representative contends that patentability resides in the fact that Smith teaches of providing two separate audio tracks while applicant's invention has one interlaced track of tick marks and audio files. Examiner respectfully disagrees in limiting the teaching of Smith for Smith was solving the problem of providing a synchronization scheme for use on CD players. A reference is good for all it teaches such that one skilled in the art would reasonably not limit Smith if the intended use was for other than a CD player. Smith provides prior art showing a single audio track. Alternatively, Smith discloses a fixed time line synchronization for the timing scheme whereas applicant teaches of an event driven synchronization sequence. However, a preliminary review of the art reveals U.S. patent No. 5,588,096 to Sato where audio sequences are triggered by events. In this light, it would be obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the event triggers of Sato into the timing scheme of Smith in order to provide a synchronized event triggered audio track.



**JOHN M. HOTALING, II**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**